



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,077	06/29/2005	Eduardo-Alexander Van Den Berg	72998-013000/US	4307

7590 07/11/2006
Greenberg Traurig
Suite 400E
2450 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, CA 90404

EXAMINER KUMAR, RAKESH	
ART UNIT 3654	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 4 and 5 cancelled by Amendment filed by Applicant on 06/21/2006.

Claims 1-3 and 6-13 are pending in this Office Action.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "6" has been used to designate both the conveyor coil in Figure 2 and a slide member in Figure 3.
2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: In specifications page 4, line 24, dividers element (9) is disclosed however it is not shown in the drawings.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "a part which reacts to money" (claim 1 line 4), "a device to handle different size vases" (claim 1 line 5) and "a paper like material provided on the inner side with a watertight plastic lining" (claim 6 line 3) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Referring to claim 3. Claim 3 recites the limitation "comprising a common dispensing opening" on line 2. It is unclear as to which common opening is being referred to when there are two openings shown. Appropriate action is required.

3. Referring to claims 6-9. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: It is unclear as to how the relationship of the vase dispenser assembly comprising a series of vases also comprises a cup shaped holder when no such interaction is shown in the dispenser assembly, furthermore it is not understood as to how the vase with the cup shaped holders are dispensed when the apparatus assembly disclosed is only shown to be capable of dispensing cup shaped structures.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartfield et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,618,073) in further view of Wittern Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,791,516).

6. Referring to claims 1 and 3. Bartfield discloses a dispensing assembly (Figure 1) comprising:

a dispensing device as for cups , each comprising a store for a series of nested cups (13-20; Figure 1),

a dispensing mechanism (44) for removing individual cups from the series (13-20) and displacing these cups (22; Figure 8),

and actuating means (138; see Figures 8 and 9 in entirety) for said dispensing mechanism (44),

the actuating means comprise a part (a part emitting a signal which indicates dispensing of cups to occur).

Wittern discloses a vending apparatus wherein the actuating means (Figure 15) is controlled by an electronic controller (11), which is activated upon depositing the appropriate moneys or tokens in the vending apparatus.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an input mechanism in the cup (or vases) dispensing assembly of Bartfield as taught by Wittern to dispense an individual cup upon reacting

Art Unit: 3654

to an insertion of a token input because the cups could be electronically dispensed without a need for a salesperson thus reducing the operating cost.

It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the dispensing assembly dispense different size cups from one assembly in order to increase the selection.

It would have also been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include two dispensing devices as compared to a the single dispensing device as disclosed by the teaching of Bartfield in order to allow multiple users to access the dispensed items. Further, it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

7. Referring to claim 2. Bartfield discloses a dispensing assembly (Figure 1) in which the store (see store area holding cup sleeves; Figure 1) is designed to receive multiple series (13-20) arranged next to one another,

one series (series 20) being arranged so as to interact with the said dispensing mechanism (44), and

conveyor means (40-42) being provided in order to move the other series (12-19) into the position of the first series (20).

8. Referring to claims 6,7 and 8. See claims above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching

Art Unit: 3654

of Bartfield in view of Wittern to include a cup (or vase) holder such that when the cup is dispensed it is positioned in a cardboard tray like holder preventing the cup (or vase) from over turning, furthermore the cup holder could be comprised of paper like material encased with a paintable plastic coating.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the size of the cup or the vase that comprises the series stack to be of a particular diameter and height, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being the within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955)

9. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartfield as in view of Wittern applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Gersten et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,803,264).

10. Referring to claims 9 and 10. Gersten discloses a paper product holder for cups (Figure 2) comprising a support part (28), which can be releasably coupled to the base part (see base of 28) of the holder (Figure 2). Gersten discloses the support part comprises a double-walled part (top and bottom parts of member 28) provided on two sides with an opening (38; see Figure 2) and the two openings being different from one another to compensate the slanted edges of the cup or a vase..

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Bartfield in view of Wittern to include a cup holder as disclosed by Gersten above because it would make carrying the cup easier.

11. Referring to claims 11-13. Regarding method claims 11-13, although Bartfield in view of Wittern and in further view of Gersten do not explicitly disclose a method of using their apparatus, the method steps recited in the claims would inherently be performed when using the apparatus of Bartfield in view of Wittern and in view of Gersten in its usual and expected fashion. See claims above for specific steps.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rakesh Kumar whose telephone number is (517) 272-8314. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (571) 272-6951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RK
July 5, 2006

Kathy Matecki
KATHY MATECKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600